

Monitoring and Evaluation





New Evaluation Policy



Implications For M&E

- Independent and Robust M&E unit at the Program Office
- M&E Specialists with M&E expertise within each Technical Offices
- USAID M&E Plan include Impact, Outcome, Output (not only Foreign Assistance Indicators)



Implications For M&E

- Steps are Taken to Evaluate the New Strategy
 - Baseline Survey is scheduled for this summer
 - Follow-up impact surveys during implementation of the strategy
- Stronger M&E effort from Partners
- Quarterly AOTR/COTR meetings will intensify datadriven discussions around reported results
- More Evaluations to be Carried Out
- Use of Evaluation Findings for better programming



Evaluation Policy

- Two major types of evaluation: *performance* and *impact* (see next slide)
- Required for all large projects (at or above average size for OU) and for innovative or pilot projects of any size (preferably impact evaluations)
- Calls for *Integration* of evaluation *into* strategy and project *design*
- Requires resources be designated for evaluation goal of about 3% of program funds on average
- Methods, whether qualitative or quantitative, should generate high quality, reproducible findings linked to the evaluation questions
- Encourages engaging *local partners* and supporting country ownership
- Establishes a high standard for *transparency* and dissemination
- Include steps to reduce bias including external evaluation team leads, disclosure of conflicts of interest, contracts managed by program offices.



Evaluation Policy

Performance evaluations

- Focus on questions linked to program design or management decisions:
 i.e., how a project is being implemented, how it is perceived and valued,
 whether expected results are occurring.
- Qualitative and quantitative methods are appropriate.
- Majority of evaluations at USAID

Impact evaluations

- Measure the change in the development outcome attributable to a given intervention.
- Requires a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual and comparison group to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change.



Evaluations

Consistent with the New Evaluation Policy

- All Pilot program should undergo a performance or impact evaluation
- Large Projects should also be evaluated
- USAID will carry those evaluations
- Partners should also plan for developing their own Baseline Surveys and Evaluations



New Initiatives

New Indicators Requirement for

- Feed the Future Initiative
- Global Health Initiative



Procurement Reform

New Indicators: Local Capacity Building Indicators

- Local NGOs are strengthening their capacity through the project implementation process
- Local NGOs are receiving grant allocations
- Local NGOs can later become USAID prime partners



Implications For health programs

- Implementation of a standardize PMTCT work plan between CDC and USAID
 - Site level PMTCT workplan associated with budget invested at the site
- Stronger M&E effort from Partners
- DQA will be conducted on standard indicators
- All partners will be encourage to provide GPS coordinates and catchment population of their sites if feasible



Implications For health programs

- Greater emphasis will be put on MOH evaluation unit "UPE"
- Donor coordination and collaboration will be emphasized as part of the UPE-centric approach
- A comprehensive database system is in planning with UPE



UPCOMING M&E ACTIVITIES

- Annual Program Results (APR) Due Nov 4 (PEPFAR partners ONLY)
- Performance Plan and Report (PPR) Due Nov 17
 - Success Stories
 - Indicator Table
- Indicator Review Meeting TBD (~Nov 30)